The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was  $\underline{\text{not}}$  written for publication and is  $\underline{\text{not}}$  binding precedent of the Board.

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

MAILED

AUG 1 2 2005

U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES Ex parte Q. PETER ZHANG and STEPHEN R. GUERIN

Appeal No. 2005-1022 Application No. 09/901,315

ON BRIEF

Before HARKCOM, <u>Vice Chief Administrative Patent Judge</u>, and NASE and CRAWFORD, <u>Administrative Patent Judges</u>.

Per curiam.

## ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL

On July 12, 2005, counsel for the appellants filed a paper requesting withdrawal of the appeal in the above-identified application.

Accordingly, the appeal in the application is <u>dismissed</u>.

The application is hereby returned to the examiner for further action as may be appropriate.

Appeal No. 2005-1022 Application No. 09/901,315

## **DISMISSED**

ice Chief Administrative Patent Judge )

JEFFREY V. NASE

Administrative Patent Judge

BOARD OF PATENT

APPEALS

AND INTERFERENCES

Administrative Patent Judge

MEC/jrg

Appeal No. 2005-1022 Application No. 09/901,315

KUDIRKA & JOBSE, LLP ONE STATE STREET SUITE 800 BOSTON, MA 02109